REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the current amendments and remarks be entered into their pending application.

Applicants thank the Examiner for amending Claim 28 to depend from Claim 23 instead of Claim 21.

Independent claims 1, 9-10, 20, and 23 have been rejected under 35 USC § 101 for failure to provide a tangible result of the claimed method steps. Dependent claims 2-8 and 23-31 hold the same deficiencies. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner holds that the steps of "determining, selecting, calculating, and evaluating would not appear to be sufficient to constitute a tangible result, since the outcome...has not been disclosed in a practical application nor made available in such a manner that its usefulness in a disclosed practical application can be realized." The Examiner holds further that these claims "would be allowable once the 101 problems are corrected."

Applicants respond that each of the rejected claims is amended to provide a clear "tangible result" for the method in the preamble and to recite accomplishment of that "tangible result" by the claimed method steps.

Further, with respect to the individual independent claims:

17

Claim 1: Misalignment, and the consequences of misalignment on measurement accuracy, are discussed in detail on pages 11-13 of the specification. Thus the "tangible results" of the method of Claim 1 are quantification of the part-to-spindle misalignment and the gauge-to-spindle angular misalignment.

Claim 9: Generally, the same comments apply as for Claim 1. Specific differences between Claims 1 and 9 are recited on pages 13-14 of the specification. Again, the "tangible result" is quantification of the part-to-spindle misalignment.

Claim 10: Generally, the material of Claim 10 is disclosed and discussed at pages 21-23 of the specification. The "tangible results" are the geometric parameters of the machine, knowledge of which allows more accurate motions to be made.

Claim 20: See the specification at page 21. This procedure is necessary in order to compute the spindle-to-gauge lateral misalignment for plano wavefronts. (Note that the procedure of Claim 1 provides the *angular* misalignment of the spindle to the gauge, but not the *lateral misalignment.*)

Claims 23 and 26: See the specification at pages 23-25 regarding A-Z axis misalignment. Note that the second (and possibly third) rotary axis is needed only if it is explicitly desired to remove the misalignment (Claim 26) rather than simply compensate for it.

Having responded to each and every objection and rejection, and having amended their claims, Applicants respectfully request early reconsideration of their Application and speedy allowance of all claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert C. Brown, Agent for Applicants

Reg. No. 37,057

Harris Beach, LLP

99 Garnsey Road

Pittsford, New York 14534

(850)-385-9456